

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

LAWRENCE E DIXON,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM H JONES, ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:19-CV-156-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Lawrence Dixon, an inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed the above-styled and numbered civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On December 19, 2019, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 37), recommending that the lawsuit should be dismissed for purposes of *in forma pauperis* proceedings pursuant to the three strikes provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1915(g). *Id.* at 3–4. A return receipt indicating delivery to Plaintiff was received by the Clerk on January 2, 2020. Docket No. 38.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge *de novo* only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a *de novo* review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did not file objections in the prescribed period.¹ The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings

¹ Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal with the Fifth Circuit on January 6, 2020. Docket No. 42. The notice of appeal,

for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews her legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 37) as the findings of this Court.


Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report (Docket No. 37) be **ADOPTED**. It is further

ORDERED that the complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for purposes of *in forma pauperis* proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Docket No. 12) is **DENIED**. This Order does not bar refiling of this lawsuit without seeking *in forma pauperis* status and upon payment of the full \$400.00 filing fee. Plaintiff may resume the lawsuit if he pays the entire filing fee of \$400 within fifteen days after the entry of the Final Judgment. It is further

ORDERED that all motions not previously ruled on are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **17th** day of **January, 2020**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

however, does not mention the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation and therefore cannot be construed as objections.